



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,229	04/27/2006	John William Chapman	056159-5261	6003
9629	7590	03/17/2011	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004				STEADMAN, DAVID J
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1656				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/539,229	CHAPMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David J. Steadman	1656	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) David J. Steadman. (3) _____.

(2) Zachary Derbyshire. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 March 2011

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

NONE

Prior art documents discussed:

Tanner et al., US Patent 5,714,377; Ng et al. US Patent Application Publication 2002/0068325

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: As a follow-up to the personal interview conducted on 3/1/11, the examiner contacted applicant's representative regarding a prior art document, Tanner et al., that was identified during a prior art search, which reference may be relevant if Ng et al. reference is antedated. The examiner noted that identifying the reference of Tanner et al. is intended for compact prosecution and that this is not an indication that Tanner et al. is the only other reference relevant to inactivating PMT protein for heterologous protein production in yeast, noting that there may be references other than Tanner et al. that are more relevant to this technology. The examiner also requested a copy of the Interview Summary for the 3/1/11 interview, noting that the electronic copy was lost due to a computer freeze. Mr. Derbyshire graciously provided the requested copy.